



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**  
**Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

*mv*

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/498,950 02/04/00 CARPENTER

J B0932/7134

┌

PM82/0802

EXAMINER
----------

Jason M. Honeyman  
Wolf Greenfield & Sacks PC Federal Reser  
600 Atlantic Avenue  
Boston MA 02210-2211

VANAMAN, F	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
------------	----------	--------------

3611  
DATE MAILED:

08/02/01

*9*

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

## Interview Summary

Application No.  
**09/498,950**

Applicant(s)  
**Carpenter et al.**

Examiner  
**Frank Vanaman**

Group Art Unit  
**3611**



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Frank Vanaman

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Neil Ferraro

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview Jul 31, 2001

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic      b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes      e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: 85 specifically, other independent claims generally

Identification of prior art discussed:

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Applicants suggested that they would send copies of the foreign references cited in the prosecution of the parent applications. Applicants indicated that parent application 09/062968 has been abandoned, but that a new application had been filed, which is now US Patent 6,224,070. As regards the claim scope issues (112, 2nd paragraph) applicants suggested the adoption of an 'adapted to' type of recitation. As regards claim 85, applicants have further argued that the ratchet clamp taught by Bumgarner would not allow the strap pieces to be secured 'against any relative lengthwise movement'. As regards the combination of Bumgarner and Pozzebon, applicants have argued that there is no motivation to make such a combination set forth in the references.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

**FRANK VANAMAN**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.